Chapter 6

Facilitating Information Sharing through Library Collection Maintenance and Preservation

Tina Baich and Sherri Michaels

Although libraries are built on a centuries old print tradition, images of future libraries do not include a vision of endless book stacks. As Deanna Marcum (2016) states, "what users primarily seek from libraries are the digital resources that they can have access to from anywhere they happen to be. Users think libraries are—or at least should be—digital" (p. 2). Library services, including interlibrary loan (ILL), are continually evolving to take advantage of technological advances. However, librarians must strike a balance between user preferences and expectations for the development of digital libraries and the fact that not all information is available in a digital format. In an effort to balance the traditional role of the library with evolving digital technology and library user needs, librarians are reevaluating and redefining collection maintenance and preservation of the print record. These new definitions allow for a strategic shift away from print collections that takes into account the need to preserve the print record alongside the changing information environment. This chapter explores that shift and the role ILL professionals can play in effecting this shift while maintaining their commitment to providing access to the scholarly record, whether print or digital, to both local and external information seekers.

The information landscape is increasingly a digital one. Library users are exhibiting a growing preference for electronic access, and the transition from print to online is virtually complete for scholarly journal content. In addition, technologies such as digital printing and

online publishing have greatly simplified the publishing process. The resulting explosion in the volume of publications, in both print and digital formats, makes the building and maintenance of comprehensive print collections unsustainable. Libraries simply do not have the space or funds to collect everything that present, let alone future, readers might want to consult. At the same time, there is technology to provide print on demand, decreasing the likelihood that a book will end up out of print and unavailable for later use or purchase. As for library information sharing, librarians have developed procedures to share digital content when license terms allow. As librarians withdraw physical materials or place them in off-site storage or shared repositories to reduce the size of their collections, ILL services play a key role as the means by which library users can obtain loans or copies of materials that are no longer held locally. All of this offers librarians greater latitude in their physical collecting strategies and the opportunity to repurpose space in answer to user and administrator demands for study rooms, collaborative workspaces, makerspaces, programming venues, or the relocation of related academic or community service offices to the library.

In light of these changes, librarians are shifting their thinking about what a library is, and should be, in order to serve user needs and remain relevant and sustainable. Libraries have been evolving from being warehouses for books for some time. They are now being reenvisioned again, and priority is increasingly being placed on the roles of librarians as service providers and research/learning partners rather than solely on their role as collectors. The value of a library thus becomes the strength and relevance of its services rather than the size and breadth of its collection. Quality, ease of access, and innovative information services become more important measures of value than the number of books on library shelves.

Of course, librarians do not want to risk the loss of the existing print record. Although libraries do not, and cannot, own the entirety of this record, it remains the mission of librarians to preserve access to that record now and in the future. One way that librarians are addressing the need to preserve access is by providing the content for mass digitization projects, such as HathiTrust or Google Books. However, U.S. copyright law prevents librarians from relying solely on digital surrogates as access, or service, copies. Therefore, librarians must develop complementary print and digital preservation strategies to ensure continued access to the print record.

In this changing environment, library collection maintenance generally refers to efforts to reduce print collections, while preservation is the effort to ensure the retention of the print record. As librarians work to maintain and preserve their collections, the ties between these activities and resource sharing grow stronger. In order to effectively reduce physical collections while minimizing the risk to access, librarians are entering into partnerships with colleagues in other like-minded libraries and developing new models of resource sharing to ensure that library users continue to have access to the information they need. ILL practitioners can play a central role in creating and maintaining the balance required between a reduction in local print collections and access and preservation. ILL librarians have a long and strong history of developing and maintaining resource sharing partnerships, which will be key to ensuring information access in the future through collective collection strategies such as shared print repositories, data-driven collections decisions, and integrated preservation and access efforts.

The Collective Collection Concept

Librarians are working collaboratively to develop new models of resource sharing that facilitate reshaping local collections in a more global, or collective, context. Lorcan Dempsey (2013) believes the phrase "collective collection" came into use to denote "a more systemic perspective … [and] more focused attention on collective collection development, management and disclosure of collections across groups of libraries at different levels" (p. 1). The collective collection, therefore, is a model for shaping existing library collections while still maintaining access in order to:

- reduce the individual footprints of libraries;
- preserve the scholarly record;
- guide prospective collecting, and;
- minimize overlap across library collections.

In this sense, there is one collective collection built across all libraries from which each can draw through resource sharing services. However, the phrases "collective collection" and "shared collection" are often used interchangeably to describe the pieces of the collective collection that reside and are managed within consortia, state, or regional cooperatives. Shared collections are built by partner libraries through intentional selection and may reside locally or within shared print repositories, which will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

Libraries are rooted in a tradition of resource sharing. However, the concept of the collective collection is simultaneously a logical extension of this tradition and a potential threat to long-standing methods of resource sharing, such as ILL. As individual libraries downsize their print collections, librarians must remain cognizant of the possibility that users will lose access to

some valuable and needed materials. If a print title disappears from all libraries in a region or country or the world, and it has not been digitized, then it certainly cannot be supplied through ILL. If only a few copies are left, they may be too fragile or rare to loan or even scan. Therefore, as libraries divest themselves of ownership, it is paramount that librarians keep access foremost in their minds. As Suzanne Ward (2015) notes, "as long as librarians act responsibly to ensure that enough print copies exist across a region for future resource sharing, they can withdraw their own library's unused copies with clear consciences" (p. x). Ensuring access and methods for doing so are the responsibility of all those who work on collection maintenance and preservation and resource sharing.

In order to act responsibly and make the collective collection model a success, collection managers have to think beyond local needs to regional and national management issues. Demas and Miller (2012) anticipate a future of collective collection management where "academic libraries will act in unison as networks of shared responsibility for storage and access to print and digital content, rather than freestanding silos of independently owned collections" (p. 169). This sort of cooperation will require data analysis to assess existing collections; formal policies and agreements that address the political and institutional ramifications of the collective collection; and strong relationships among partner libraries. Trust and risk mitigation will be extremely important for many libraries and crucial to success (Demas and Miller, 2012).

If librarians can rely on each other to share the burden and responsibility of providing access to print resources and actively coordinating prospective collecting, then there is less need for every library to purchase a broad range of books just in case a local library user might one day need them. This reliance requires not only trust but also a well-developed infrastructure to ensure that access is not only possible but also efficient and expedient. If librarians work

together, then they can maintain access to a large, shared collection, while simultaneously reducing individual ownership. This level of cooperation is challenging but ILL practitioners can lend their expertise in the development and maintenance of successful partnerships. Information sharing and delivery systems must also be invested in, valued, and work in tandem with demand-driven acquisitions and collaborative collection development efforts for access to be maintained. In this scenario, ILL becomes even more of a core service, necessary in making the collective management of print collections viable.

As librarians embrace the idea of the collective collection, they require a mechanism to operationalize the concept and place their individual collections in a larger context. Shared print initiatives represent the practical application of the collective collection concept and have become the primary method for library consortia to systematically break down boundaries and move in the direction of a collective collection. Though shared print initiatives are happening around the globe, the following section focuses on the different types of projects currently underway across the United States.

The Shape of Shared Print

The need for space and storage in libraries is not a new phenomenon. In 1902, Charles Eliot of Harvard University lamented the need for more storage space and even proposed a "mode of storing disused books, so that they may be kept safe and accessible, and yet at a low cost for shelter and annual care" (p. 53). Mr. Eliot even proposed that the storage of these books should be done by region so that not everyone was storing duplicates and that "not more than two copies of any book should be preserved" (p. 53). Thus, the notion of a regional shared print repository has been around for well over a hundred years. More coordinated and large-scale

efforts, however, are a much more recent development. Regional repositories are also just one of the possible models. The reasons for creating shared print repositories vary, depending on participant needs; therefore, the possible models are as varied as those needs. Not only are regional, state, or national models of shared print in place but there are also variations in the type of materials collected, how the materials are stored, and whether the materials will circulate. Each of these decisions may have significant implications for access to information through library resource sharing and, therefore, should be well thought-out before the implementation of any approach.

One of the earliest models of sharing print library materials is through a shared depository or warehouse. The New England Deposit Library was founded in 1938 and served Boston area institutions. According to Downs (1945), "[e]conomy of storage, elimination of duplication, and division of fields among libraries are primary objectives" (p. 414). These continue to be primary drivers of such initiatives today. There are many more recent examples of joint repositories such as the Five College Library Depository, Research Collections Access and Preservation Consortium (Re-CAP), and the Washington Research Libraries Consortium. As Reilly (2003) points out, "Many of the regional repositories … are more than cost-effective solutions to collections storage; they are a means through which multiple institutions work together and pool resources to manage significant portions of their holdings. They offer a shared space in which collections deposited by different libraries are maintained under a common regime: they are included in a common inventory-control system, subjected to common standards for bar codes and labeling, and shelved in standardized units. Their circulation is managed by a single organization" (p. 2). In addition, shared repositories are likely to have policies governing other areas of shared concern, such as ownership, duplication, and interlibrary

loan. The development of such facilities and the selection of materials to be stored there should, therefore, include and involve resource sharing practitioners. ILL librarians have the broadest knowledge of the wants and needs of both their own library users and those of their library's closest resource sharing partners. They also often hold responsibility for their library's delivery mechanisms and can bring insight into the logistics of off-site storage and retrieval as well as discovery systems.

Many librarians already work within a network or a consortium to share resources and distribute costs through activities such as a shared catalog, cooperative purchasing, or ILL. As these partners began to discuss and collaborate on their common need to house and preserve access to print more efficiently, they sought joint solutions. Many shared print repositories are regional in nature because they are an outgrowth of these established working relationships within a known and trusted network. Trust amongst partners is cited as a necessary ingredient in several articles and surveys about shared print repositories. According to a recent ARL survey by Crist and Stambaugh (2014), "when choosing partners to collaborate with around print collections, the responding libraries most value partners within the same resource sharing consortium, but not necessarily the same state or province" (p. 16). Thus, many repositories are looking to their trusted resource sharing partners as possible collaborators in these initiatives.

Another model for repositories is one in which the focus is not on a region but on a type of material. For example, the National Library of Medicine and its partners are committed to holding 250 important print serial titles in medicine. There are also specialized repositories for law materials, agricultural materials, and federal documents. Bernard Reilly (2003), in his text *Developing Print Repositories*, discusses other types of specialized repositories such as that of the American Antiquarian Society, a collection of U.S. imprints published before 1877. Reilly

points out that "the archival conditions of care afforded the Society's holdings, and the fact that they do not circulate except for special exhibit loans, provides a high level of assurance that they will be preserved ..." (p. 31). This raises one of the primary concerns of resource sharing professionals: the maintenance of information access for all. While the material in a shared print repository may be well preserved, this does not also mean that ready access is guaranteed. Most repositories are actually light archives, meaning that their materials do circulate. There is increasing discussion among members of shared print repositories that preserving access to materials is as equally important as preserving them. This is good news for information seekers and the library resource sharing community.

According to the previously mentioned ARL survey by Crist and Stambaugh (2015), "the primary goals of shared print programs … are 1) to preserve and provide access to the scholarly record; 2) to more effectively and efficiently manage print collections; and 3) to create opportunities for libraries to make informed collection management decisions about duplicates" (p. 15). Space and storage needs are primary drivers in efficiently managing print collections. To address the space needs and the question of duplicates, many shared print repositories began with a focus on archiving journals. Bound journals take up a lot of space in library stacks, and with increasing electronic access to both current issues and back files these materials were seen as a logical candidate for shared print efforts. Not every library in a consortium wants or needs to retain long runs of titles that are widely held among all of their partners, or across the country. Electronic access and license rights to share digital copies through ILL, combined with a couple of secured backup print copies, allows librarians to seriously consider the option of withdrawing copies and creating some much needed space.

While journals may have been seen as the "low-hanging fruit" with which to begin a process of shared print storage, monographs have not been ignored, and indeed some shared print repositories started with or focus solely on monographs. There are several reasons that monographs are attractive for a shared print model. One is sheer numbers. Libraries generally hold far more monographs in their collections than journals. Since all libraries have some subset of low-use monographs, it may also be easier to justify weeding unused copies or storing them collectively. Constance Malpas, in an OCLC research report, found that a number of titles were highly duplicated. While she was comparing holdings against the HathiTrust corpus, she noted, "there is opportunity for significant library space recovery associated with de-duplication of low-use titles for which aggregate library supply exceeds projected demand. As of June 2010, there are at least 25,000 titles archived in digital format by Hathi for which collective library print holdings per title exceed 1,000 libraries; more than 900 titles in the HathiTrust Digital Library are held in print by more than 2,500 libraries" (p. 31). Of course, not everything in HathiTrust is accessible to everyone because of copyright considerations. Still, even among this sample, there were some titles that were held very widely in print, allowing the possibility of removing duplicates from an individual collection without much impact on the collective collection. As Rick Lugg (2012) states, "There are enormous opportunities here which can be realized with negligible risk, by removing some excess copies from the collective collection. Addressing this is simply another form of good stewardship, and should be pursued whether or not a library needs more space" (p. 199).

Joint storage and maintenance in a repository are not the only solution in a shared print scenario. Another more recent model is one in which shared items are actually held in place and not moved to a repository at all. For example, Western Regional Storage Trust (WEST) has a

distributed model where specific journal holdings are held at participating libraries rather than relocated to a central facility. Bibliographic records are updated to indicate that a title is being held for WEST, and that holdings information is shared through local catalogs, bibliographic utilities, and archiving registries. By sharing this information broadly, others can see what is being held and can therefore make appropriate, informed decisions regarding withdrawals and collection maintenance in their own libraries with confidence. There are a few major differences, however, between shared storage and a distributed model. Collocated collections can be maintained and serviced at a cheaper cost, although it is expensive to move them in the first place. Holding in place allows librarians to keep only what they are obligated to keep and to potentially get rid of the rest. In both cases, of course, it is important to update holdings records so that information about holdings and access are complete and correct.

One way that librarians record and let others know about their participation in shared print programs is through their bibliographic records. In an OCLC Print Archives Disclosure Pilot, a coordinating committee was asked to "explore ways in which libraries could use OCLC features and services to disclose retention commitments and support resource sharing for shared print resources" (OCLC, 2012, p. 1). This was the first step in what eventually led to the creation of detailed metadata guidelines. The committee was also asked to "evaluate the impact of the proposed metadata standard on resource sharing workflows" (OCLC, 2012, p. 2). Therefore, the metadata guidelines were developed and tested with an eye toward being able to facilitate common lending and borrowing practices. One of the recommendations from the final report was that there should be a separate holding symbol used to identify shared print titles held in repositories or full-service libraries. This would facilitate resource sharing by allowing "the library or shared print program to define different lending behaviors for these items compared to

materials in the general collection or storage facility" (p. 7). A second recommendation was to enter holding-level print archives data into MARC holdings records. ILL professionals, again, all appreciate the necessity of updated, detailed, and correct holdings records. The final recommendation, and a precursor to the more fully developed detailed metadata guidelines, was the proposal to use the 583 field in a MARC record to describe the various aspects of the shared print commitment. As noted in the report, "The LHR [Local Holdings Record] will include one, two, or three 583 Action Notes, as appropriate. At a minimum, include one 583 Action Note to identify the retention commitment ("committed to retain") and the retention period. If the print resources are reviewed for completeness, provide a second 583 Action Note ("completeness reviewed") and note the outcomes of that review (e.g. missing units, binding anomalies, reprints). If the print resources are also reviewed for condition, provide a third 583 Action Note ("condition reviewed") with the outcomes of that review" (OCLC, 2012, p. 2). While these three recommendations were implemented, they also continue to be discussed and revised. The original metadata standard has been revised and expanded and discussions continue regarding the need for a separate OCLC symbol with holdings attached. These are developments that resource sharing practitioners should keep an eye on as they have an impact on borrowing and lending practices.

Another way that librarians are recording their participation in shared print initiatives is through archive registries. The Center for Research Libraries (CRL), in conjunction with the California Digital Library (CDL), hosts the Print Archives Preservation Registry (PAPR) (http://papr.crl.edu/) designed to support regional and national level print archiving efforts in North America. This registry currently lists 40 archiving programs. PAPR is an important tool that coordinates the various shared print projects and moves libraries toward the development of

a national network. As Schonfeld (2015) points out, “Our safety net is getting better, but it is not good enough …” (p. 5). He goes on to say that “PAPR and to some extent OCLC’s Worldcat as well will allow us to begin to analyze our achievements and identify gaps” (p. 5). By having a registry of archiving programs, it will be possible to compare holdings and commitments across repositories to ensure that all libraries are not storing the same things and to identify whether any large swaths of content are not being stored by any library. This is just the first step in a more coordinated effort to preserve materials for long-term access and use.

In addition to PAPR, CRL also hosts the Print Archiving Network, or PAN. PAN has an e-mail discussion list and regularly meets at American Library Association conferences to provide a forum for those involved in print archiving. Common interests and issues are discussed allowing for broader collaboration between shared print projects. This is exactly what happened recently when several PAN members got together to discuss how a broader, national infrastructure for shared print might be developed. As Armstrong et al. (2015) report, “representatives from four state and regional shared print journal programs met in Rosemont, Illinois to explore opportunities for national or North American collaboration. Eighteen attendees, including deans of libraries, shared print program leadership, and analysts gathered to consider the possibilities of broader collaboration. Participants specifically discussed strategies for broader collections and operations coordination, more effective and cohesive decision-support systems, shared governance and the possible scope of institutional participation in an initial implementation and future phases” (p. 1). This type of collaboration across networks will be necessary to ensure that shared print initiatives are successful in the long term.

Data-Driven Decision Making

Collection maintenance decisions, whether made in conjunction with a shared print initiative or not, should be data-driven. In recent years, services have been developed to better facilitate the analysis of collection data by companies such as Sustainable Collection Services (SCS) now owned by OCLC. Data-driven collection decisions are frequently based on circulation statistics, length of time in the collection, publication date, number of copies in a consortium or geographic region, or some combination thereof. ILL practitioners should make sure that any deselection criteria also take into account how readily available withdrawal candidates will be through ILL (i.e., total holdings across the consortium, state, and/or country). By basing deselection decisions on such data, librarians reduce the likelihood of an adverse effect on resource sharing and library user access to information.

Data accuracy is crucial to both successful shared print initiatives and resource sharing. As mentioned earlier, holdings data is of particular importance. When embarking on a shared print initiative, ensuring that a library's holdings are up to date in any relevant bibliographic utility is essential for the distribution of retention commitments and accurate assessment of the number of copies present within a consortium. As the initiative progresses, frequent holdings updates will benefit ILL practitioners in both requesting and supplying libraries by allowing potential borrowers to locate the true owners of any requested material and reducing requests for material a library no longer owns. As Suzanne Ward (2015) so aptly puts it, "It is both time-consuming and frustrating to process ILL requests that e-holdings information shows as available only to find that the volumes were withdrawn six months previously" (p. 87). This holds true for the journal holdings of which Ward speaks, as well as for monographs or any other materials being withdrawn.

If the initiative culminates in retention commitments, or an agreement among libraries to retain certain titles for a set period of time, then these should be recorded in local catalogs and bibliographic utilities for the benefit of partner libraries, the library community at large, and all members of library communities. Though best practices for recording this data are evolving, OCLC has established detailed metadata guidelines for including retention commitments in local holdings records within the WorldCat database (https://www.oclc.org/en-CA/services/projects/shared-print-management/metadata-guidelines.html), discussed in more detail earlier in this chapter. ILL practitioners should become familiar with what the recorded data means because it may give insight into the availability of items for ILL requesting and supplying.

Ensuring Access through Preservation

Preservation versus Service Copies

It is essential that librarians ensure continued access to the print record while achieving the goals of reducing collection footprints and minimizing unnecessary overlap with other collections. One solution is the creation of dark and light archives. Dark archives hold non-circulating preservation copies in order to mitigate the risk of loss; light archives contain service copies that circulate to library users. While this may be a sound approach, there is much discussion about how many print copies are enough. How many preservation copies does it take to eliminate risk? Was Eliot (1902) correct when he opined that "not more than two copies of any book should be preserved" (p. 53)?

Some believe that all the physical objects within library collections have artifactual value and therefore should be preserved. Nicholas Baker, for instance, is a well-known opponent of the

replacement of print originals with digital surrogates (Baker, 2001). Recognizing that Baker's position is extreme and virtually impossible to achieve in practice, others have offered more strategic approaches to the question of library holdings as artifacts (Nichols and Smith, 2001). However, the discussions noted here predate the development of shared print initiatives and the need for more specific standards regarding the number of preservation copies actually required to prevent loss.

Several authors note the need for research into the number of copies question (Kieft and Payne, 2010; Demas and Lougee, 2011). Ithaka S+R commissioned research into the number of print journal copies needed for preservation purposes, which Schonfeld and Housewright (2009) reported on in their paper *What to Withdraw?* They state that there is "the need for at least one print copy of well-digitized digitally preserved text-only materials to be available for at least 20 years" (p. 2). They go on to say that this requires that "a minimum of two page-verified print repository copies" be retained in dark archives now (p. 2), which aligns with Eliot's recommendation of more than 100 years ago. While Schonfeld and Housewright (2009) also suggest a hybrid preservation model where "two dark, page-verified copies" can be supplemented by four service, volume-verified copies, this model again addresses preservation rather than access needs (p. 17). While this preservation model may be able to be extended to monographs, the question of how many service copies are required to meet user needs still remains.

Librarians have attempted to anticipate the use of their collections for decades with minimal success. Even though many consortial, state, and regional groups are engaging in collective collection efforts, there is no accepted number of service copies. Instead, each group defines its own number based on the scope of the project and the level of risk acceptable to its

members. Interlibrary loan librarians have access to important use data including what material is requested and with what frequency, which could influence these decisions. They could share this data and actively engage in much needed research into the optimal number of service copies.

Rare Materials

Although shared print initiatives are often used to identify material for deselection or archiving, these projects can also identify rare materials within a library's collection. How librarians decide to handle these materials can impact access and therefore resource sharing. Librarians must strike a balance between the competing priorities of preserving the print record and preserving access to it. Items that are unique to a library's collection may be transferred to special collections, which increases the material's safety but can severely restrict both local and collective access to it.

Although librarians traditionally assume that special collections will not be loaned via ILL, a 2010 OCLC Research survey found a positive trend toward sharing with less than one-third of respondents stating that they do not participate in any level of ILL of special collections (Dooley and Luce, p. 40). In the same survey report, Dooley and Luce suggest that "the special collections community would earn political capital by developing—and generously implementing—best practices to facilitate more widespread participation in resource sharing" (p. 40). The obvious place for ILL and special collections librarians to look for such best practices are the *Guidelines for Interlibrary and Exhibition Loan of Special Collections Materials* developed by the Association for College & Research Libraries (ACRL) Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS).

Despite these best practices, Massie (2013) notes that "while an increasing number of curators are willing to consider the physical loan of materials …, the workflows for considering and executing such loans tend toward unscalable" (p. 7). If some materials must become non-circulating, then ILL practitioners should work with their special collections departments to develop mutually efficient workflows to deal with requests for them. Options include allowing "in library use only" loans, supervised use, fulfilling copy requests only, and digitization.

Digitization

Today's library users are accustomed to digital content and, in some cases, prefer and expect it. As Schaffner, Snyder, and Supple (2011) note, "delivering digitized versions of materials is now a core function in libraries and archives" (p. 5). They also point out that special collections librarians and archivists have some catching up to do in this area. "Conservative, and sometimes justifiable, assumptions about copying rare and unique materials often result in time-consuming, overly-cautious procedures. These labor-intensive processes and outdated policies can be streamlined to fit both the circumstances of requests and institutional resources" (p. 5). At the same time, scanning and electronic delivery are such standard routines in interlibrary loan that ILL librarians can serve as mentors in establishing efficient and scalable workflows for digitization services. Creating a preservation quality digital copy and broadening access to it may simply require extending the collaboration to include the library department responsible for digital collections.

Any digitization resulting from a shared print initiative must take copyright law into consideration. Some materials identified as rare may still be under copyright and therefore will only be eligible for copy requests rather than for complete digitization. However, if a library's

rare materials are old enough to have entered the public domain, then serious consideration should be given to the creation of digital surrogates either in response to ILL and other user requests or more proactively through an ongoing digitization program. Schaffner, Snyder, and Supple outline methods "to provide efficient and economical delivery of digital copies" in their report *Scan and Deliver* that may be useful to libraries in the development of their own services (p. 5). There are also well-established programs that can serve as a model, such as the digitization service of the University of Central Florida Libraries (UCFL) described in Shrauger and Dotson (2010). Through this collaboration, UCFL's ILL department was able to increase the fill rate for ILL lending requests for special collections items and provide the staff to digitize other important primary source material from special collections. Over the course of three years, Shrauger and Dotson found that nearly a quarter of special collections items requested through ILL were in the public domain and thus eligible for digitization and sharing through online collections (p. 135). This benefits all information seekers regardless of their location today and in the future.

While digitization is a solution for many non-circulating items, library users have not all embraced electronic books in the same way that they have electronic journals. Librarians must decide whether or not to rely on the growing number of digital surrogates of monographs available through such repositories as the HathiTrust and Internet Archive when making deselection decisions. Will electronic copies meet the needs of all users? Are they appropriate for both recreational and scholarly uses? Are these electronic copies preserved in a sustainable way and available to read in a user-friendly format? Can these electronic copies be shared? Schonfeld and Housewright (2009) suggest several reasons why print should be retained in conjunction with digital surrogates for a set amount of time, including "the need to fix scanning errors;

insufficient reliability of the digital provider; inadequate preservation of the digitized versions; the presence of significant quantities of important non-textual material that may be poorly represented in digital form; and campus political considerations" (p. 2). Perhaps rather than relying on digital surrogates as the only means of preservation, the existence of a digital surrogate should merely reduce the number of print copies currently retained.

In addition to the digitization of print materials, there is now an ever-increasing amount of content that is born digital. Electronic scholarly journals are now the norm. Stable digital content and the speed of electronic delivery systems allow article requests to be filled as quickly as, if not more quickly than, a request for the same article to be scanned and delivered from local collections. If copyright laws and license terms protect library information sharing, then all of this makes it unnecessary for multiple libraries to retain print journal volumes that are readily available through interlibrary loan should a user for some reason need a physical copy.

Conclusion

As ILL services and resource sharing networks become more and more robust, the ability of librarians to collaborate and think collectively about collections has grown. The thinking in the field has evolved from last copy policies to cooperative collection development to the collective collection concept. However, there are a number of questions that still need to be answered in order to increase the viability of the collective collection. In addition to those posed earlier, librarians engaged in shared print initiatives must ask themselves the following questions: What happens when copies get lost? How many copies are needed regionally and nationally to support a strong network that still facilitates access? Will librarians be willing to share outside of their immediate region? Will librarians still be willing to retain preservation

copies when their initial commitment expires? Will shared responsibility still be viable in 20 years if space comes at an even higher premium? Will print retention still be necessary in 20 years or will digital surrogates be sufficient for preservation and access? Can librarians coordinate efforts on the national level to ensure that nothing is lost from the print record? No one has the answers to all of these questions, but librarians, including resource sharing librarians, are engaging in the necessary conversations and building a strong foundation for future collaboration.

Libraries in the United States have engaged in limited efforts to coordinate collections at the national level, which is in keeping with the decentralized nature of the higher education system and political structure (Schonfeld and Housewright, 2009, p. 5). Nonetheless, answering the many questions raised previously will require national coordination. As Schonfeld and Housewright aptly note, "most librarians … expect to see print versions remain available to their community from some remote location. Often, these expectations are based on informal and sometimes inaccurate assumptions" such as the belief that large research universities will never weed material (p. 7). Collection decisions made in this manner create "a very real risk that so many copies may be discarded as to threaten the availability of certain materials in their original format" (Schonfeld and Housewright, 2009, p. 8). Librarians must make data-driven decisions and in order to mitigate risk, these decisions should be based not only on local circulation and ILL data but also on the use and holdings data of the collective collection.

The Center for Research Libraries (CRL) has led the call for collaboration in the areas of print preservation and access since 2003, with the convening of "Preserving America's Print Resources" to address concerns that libraries acting independently may result in the loss of materials from the print record. By 2009, efforts were focused on bringing together regional

consortia to consider existing cooperative efforts and to begin discussing a more systematic national effort (Kieft and Reilly, 2009, p. 107). The following year, a group of librarians came together to discuss "a framework for large-scale collaboration" as well as concerns and areas for further research (Kieft and Payne, 2010, p. 230). Slowly but surely, progress toward a national collective collection is being made. Kieft and Payne (2012) have put forward a vision for the "ideal state for academic library print collections in the 2020s" that allows "readers and researchers to discover and take full advantage of a universally available, communally preserved, audited library of digitized text and to discover and borrow preserved print materials through consortially funded and governed repository and archiving systems" (p. 137). This, of course, would benefit public library users as well. "One of the main components of this deepened collaboration is the collaborative redevelopment of local print collections into regional and national collectives through the creation of large-scale, systematic dependencies that ensure expansion of access to materials through digitization, through collaborative retention of copies that could disappear in the deaccessioning processes of individual libraries, and through the provision of more consistent preservation and conservation treatment of those copies that remain" (Kieft and Payne, 2012, p. 151).

Thanks to various library funders and organizations, some of the infrastructure required to achieve this vision is now in place through the "coordinated development of information systems, data elements, and standards that support an international capacity to analyze, compare, and archive collections" (Kieft and Payne, 2012, p. 139). However, key elements in scaling up shared print initiatives to the national level are still needed, including continued increases in interoperability and cost-sharing and improved information systems (Kieft and Payne, 2012). It is also essential to develop "best practices documentation on how to build and govern deep and

mutually dependent resource-sharing partnerships" (Kieft and Payne, 2012, p. 147). Again, this is an area where ILL librarians can lend their expertise and contribute to the success of the collective collection.

As discussed throughout this chapter, ILL librarians have a crucial role to play in the successful execution of shared print initiatives and in minimizing any potential negative impacts on traditional resource sharing and information access. In addition, the provision of effective and efficient ILL services is a key factor to the long-term viability and sustainability of shared print initiatives and the collective management of print. Creating a collective collection requires a resource sharing mind-set because the collective collection is meant to serve both individual needs and the collective good. The shared print projects that have grown out of this concept enable librarians to balance the need to reduce the footprints of their physical collections, while honoring the long-standing library traditions of providing access to information and preserving the scholarly and cultural record for future generations. Interlibrary loan librarians share in the responsibility of the collective collection because of their experience with relationship building, collaborative mind-set, and commitment to information access. Together, librarians can use library space and funds for the greatest benefit of library users, while also preserving access through resource sharing networks and ILL services.

References

Armstrong, K. et al. (2015). *Thinking bigger: Exploring strategies for North American coordination of state and regional shared print journal archiving programs*. Retrieved from http://www.aserl.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Thinking-Bigger-meeting-precis-final.pdf.

Association for College & Research Libraries, Rare Books and Manuscripts Section. (2012). *ACRL/RBMS Guidelines for Interlibrary and Exhibition Loan of Special Collections Materials*. Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/specialcollections.

Baker, N. (2001). *Double fold: Libraries and the assault on paper*. New York: Random House.

Center for Research Libraries. (n.d.). *Print archives preservation registry*. Retrieved from http://papr.crl.edu.

Crist, R., & Stambaugh, E. (2014). *SPEC Kit 345: Shared print programs*. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries.

Demas, S., & Lougee, W. (2011). Shaping a national collective collection: Will your campus participate? *Library Issues, 31*(6), 1-4.

Demas, S., & Miller, M. E. (2012). Rethinking collection management plans: Shaping collective collections for the 21st century. *Collection Management*, *37*(3-4), 168–187. Retrieved from http://doi.org/10.1080/01462679.2012.685415.

Dempsey, L., Lavoie, B., Malpas, C., Connaway, L. S., Schonfeld, R. C., Shipengrover, J., & Waibel, G. (2013). *Understanding the collective collection: Towards a system-wide*

perspective on library print collections. Dublin, OH: OCLC Research. Retrieved from http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/library/2013/2013-09r.html.

Dooley, J. M., and Luce, K. (2010). *Taking our pulse: The OCLC research survey of special collections and archives*. Dublin, OH: OCLC Research. Retrieved from http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/library/2010/2010-11.pdf.

Downs, Robert B. (1945). American library cooperation in review. *College and Research Libraries, 6*(4), 407-422.

Eliot, C. W. (1902). The division of a library into books in use, and books not in use, with different storage methods for the two classes of books. *Library Journal, 27*(7), 51-56.

Kieft, R. H., & Payne, L. (2010). A nation-wide planning framework for large-scale collaboration on legacy print monograph collections. *Collaborative Librarianship, 2*(4), 229–33. Retrieved from http://www.collaborativelibrarianship.org/.

Kieft, R. H., and Payne, L. (2012). Collective collection, collective action. *Collection Management, 37*(3-4), 137–52. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01462679.2012.685411.

Kieft, R. H., & Reilly, B. F. (2009). Regional and national cooperation on legacy print collections. *Collaborative Librarianship, 1*(3), 106-108. Retrieved from http://www.collaborativelibrarianship.org/.

Lugg, R. (2012). Data-driven deselection for monographs: a rules-based approach to weeding, storage, and shared print decisions. *Insights, 25*(2), 198-204. Retrieved from http://doi.org/10.1629/2048-7754.25.2.198.

Malpas, Constance. (2011). *Cloud-sourcing research collections: Managing print in the mass-Digitized library environment*. Dublin, OH: OCLC Research. Retrieved from: http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/library/2011/2011-01.pdf.

Marcum, D. (2016). *Library leadership for the digital age*. New York: ITHAKA S+R. Retrieved from http://sr.ithaka.org/?p=277583.

Massie, D. (2013). *Tiers for fears: Sensible, streamlined sharing of special collections*. Dublin, OH: OCLC Research. Retrieved from http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/library/2013/2013-03.pdf.

Nichols, S. G., & Smith, A. (2001). *The evidence in hand: Report of the task force on the artifact in library collections*. Washington, DC: Council on Library and Information Resources. Retrieved from http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/reports/pub103/pub103.pdf.

OCLC. (n.d.). *Detailed metadata guidelines.* Retrieved from https://www.oclc.org/en-CA/services/projects/shared-print-management/metadata-guidelines.html.

OCLC. (2012). *Print archives disclosure pilot final report.* Retrieved from https://www.oclc.org/content/dam/oclc/productworks/OCLCPrintArchivesDisclosurePilotFinalReport.pdf.

Reilly Jr., B. F. (2003). *Developing print repositories: Models for shared preservation and access.* Washington, DC: Council on Library and Information Resources.

Schaffner, J., Snyder, F., and Supple, S. (2011). *Scan and deliver: Managing user-initiated digitization in special collections and archives*. Dublin, OH: OCLC Research. Retrieved from http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/library/2011/2011-05.pdf.

Schonfeld, R. C. (2015). *Taking stock: Sharing responsibility for print preservation*. New York: ITHAKA S+R. Retrieved from http://sr.ithaka.org/?p=241080.

Schonfeld, R. C., & Housewright, R. (2009). *What to withdraw? Print collection management in the wake of digitization*. New York: ITHAKA S+R. Retrieved from http://sr.ithaka.org/?p=22357.

Shrauger, K. J., & Dotson, L. (2010). Scan by numbers: interlibrary loan lending statistics shape digital initiative. *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery & Electronic Reserve, 20*(3), 135-148. Retrieved from http://doi.org/10.1080/1072303X.2010.488517.

Ward, S. M. (2015). *Rightsizing the academic library collection*. Chicago, IL: ALA Editions.